

17

OPINIONS OF TEACHERS AND PRINCIPALS CONCERNING
THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE DES MOINES
ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS EVALUATIVE
IN-SERVICE PROGRAM, 1962-63

A Field Report
Presented to
The Graduate Division
Drake University

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Science in Education

by
James Dean Pierson
August 1963

1963
P615

16 22C
109

OPINIONS OF TEACHERS AND PRINCIPALS CONCERNING
THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE DES MOINES
ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS EVALUATIVE
IN-SERVICE PROGRAM, 1962-63

by

James Dean Pierson

Approved by Committee:

Ruby Woodworth
Chairman

Earle I. Canfield
Dean of the Graduate Division

195587

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. THE PROBLEM AND METHOD OF PROCEDURE	1
The Problem	1
Statement of the problem	1
Explanation of <u>The Elementary Evaluative</u>	
<u>Criteria</u>	2
Importance of the study	2
Limitations of the study	3
Method of Procedure	3
Organization of Remainder of the Study	7
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	8
The Historical Evolution of Elementary	
Evaluative Criteria	9
The Bases of In-Service Education through	
the Use of Elementary Evaluative Criteria	17
The Purposes of In-Service Education through	
the Use of Elementary Evaluative Criteria	25
The Procedures of In-Service Education through	
the Utilization of Elementary Evaluative	
Criteria	27
III. QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS	34
The Structure of, Frequency of, and Methods	
Employed in In-Service Building Meetings	
Concerned with Self-Evaluation	35

CHAPTER

The Ways in Which Regular Organized In-Service Meetings Concerned with the Elementary Evaluative Criteria Were of Help in Improving Teacher Efficiency	37
The Ways in Which the Elementary Evaluative Criteria Helped to Motivate Teachers to Make Personal Preparations for Periodic Self-Evaluation	39
How the Elementary Evaluative Criteria Which Were Included in the Evaluative Program Were Helpful in Suggesting Ways to Improve Teacher Efficiency	41
General Considerations or Suggestions of the Teachers and Principals Participating in the Survey that Pertained to the Elementary Evaluative Criteria or the In-Service Building Meetings Which Were Based upon Elementary Evaluative Criteria	42
Summary	45
IV. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	49
Summary	50
Conclusions	53
Recommendations	53

BIBLIOGRAPHY	55
APPENDIX	60

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM AND METHOD OF PROCEDURE

During the school year 1962-63, faculties in sixty-one Des Moines public elementary schools subjected their educational program to evaluation through in-service meetings concerned with The Elementary Evaluative Criteria, a self-evaluative checklist of teacher strengths and weaknesses in all curricular areas, developed in a summer principals' workshop in 1962.

I. THE PROBLEM

Statement of the problem. The problem of this study was to ascertain the reactions of both teachers and principals concerning the effectiveness of the elementary evaluative in-service program conducted in the public elementary schools of Des Moines, Iowa, 1962-63 school year. More specifically, through a questionnaire sent to Des Moines elementary school personnel, this study attempted to answer the following questions:

1. In what ways were regular organized in-service meetings concerned with the elementary evaluative criteria of help in improving teacher efficiency?
2. How were the elementary evaluative criteria, which were included in the elementary evaluative program

helpful in suggesting ways to improve teacher efficiency?

3. In what ways did the elementary evaluative criteria help to motivate teachers to make personal preparations for periodic self-evaluation?
4. Which in-service experiences motivated by the elementary evaluative criteria were identifiable by teachers and principals as effective and worthy of consideration for future use?

Explanation of The Elementary Evaluative Criteria.

The elementary school principals in the Des Moines public schools developed what was termed "evaluative criteria." This consisted of lists of questions with which teachers were to evaluate their work in various curricular areas. This work was published August, 1962. During the 1962-63 school year, organized faculty attention was to be given to the criteria in all elementary schools.

Importance of the study. When any self-evaluative policy is put into practice, and after a trial period has elapsed, a progress report pertaining to the effectiveness of that policy becomes necessary since the policy functions primarily as a basis for further work toward improving the existing program in the school.¹ By checking at this time

¹Willard S. Elsbree and Harold J. McNally, Elemen-

it might be that clues to greater and lesser effectiveness of handling could be secured for greater future effectiveness.

Limitations of the study. The limitations of the study were as follows:

1. This study was carried out for the school year 1962-63--the effectiveness of evaluation is constantly changing.
2. The questionnaires used in the study were selective rather than all-inclusive and comprehensive.
3. Teachers and principals completed the forms in their respective schools at their leisure, thereby presenting a possibility of procrastination.
4. Responses of eleven per cent of the principals and nineteen per cent of the teachers were not received. These responses might have influenced this study further.

II. METHOD OF PROCEDURE

Permission to carry out the study was sought and secured from the administrative heads of the Des Moines Independent Community School District. In addition, the

tary School Administration and Supervision (second edition; New York: American Book Co., 1959), p. 184.

administrators were interested in the study to the extent of offering the service of the school mailing system and an allotment of time to address all elementary principals at a regularly scheduled principals' meeting.

The problem was then approached by constructing two sets of questionnaires. One set was to be distributed to the teachers and the other set was to be distributed to the elementary principals. Each set covered the effectiveness of the elementary evaluative in-service program conducted during the 1962-63 school year.

Two sets of questionnaires were prepared. One set was distributed on a trial basis to six teachers and the other set was distributed on a trial basis to three elementary principals. Through discussions pertaining to the project, questionnaires, and their responses, the nine participating individuals indicated that an additional item was desirable on each set of questionnaires. The item was then included and a second trial of the two sets of questionnaires was made with an identical number of six different teachers and three different principals. No additional changes were found necessary in the questionnaires at this time. Copies of the questionnaires have been included in the appendix.

Every fifth elementary teacher, from kindergarden through sixth grade, in each school was selected from the

Des Moines Teachers Directory to participate in the survey. In elementary schools of less than five teachers, of which there were four, a teacher from that school was selected at random. A total of 145 teachers, representing seventeen per cent of the 824.5 elementary teachers in Des Moines public schools, were polled. Of the 145 elementary teachers polled, 118, or eighty-one per cent, responded to the questionnaire for a total of fourteen per cent of representation of the entire elementary teaching staff in Des Moines public schools.

Distribution and collection of questionnaires sent to the 145 selected elementary teachers was carried out through the weekly school mailing service. The questionnaires were received by the selected teachers March 26, 1963 and were to be completed in their respective buildings. Upon completion, the teachers' responses were to be mailed to the writer's school through the weekly school mailing service.

The entire staff of forty-eight elementary building principals, representing all sixty-one elementary schools, were included in the survey. Thirteen of the forty-eight principals were the administrative heads of two schools and were to complete separate questionnaires for each of the twenty-six schools they represented. The remaining thirty-five principals were administrative heads of one school and were to complete a single questionnaire representing that

school. A total of forty-eight elementary principals, representing all sixty-one elementary schools, were polled. Fifty-four, or eighty-nine per cent, of the elementary schools were represented by response to the questionnaire.

Distribution of the questionnaire, explanation of the study, and explanation of the questionnaire were made personally to the elementary principals at the March 22, 1963 principals' meeting. The principals were to return to their buildings and complete the questionnaires. Upon completion, the principals' responses were to be mailed to the writer's school through the weekly school mailing service.

The questionnaires were not coded and no attempt was made to connect the teacher-principal respondents to any of the sixty-one schools participating in the study.

Every effort was made to insure the maximum per cent of returns. There remained the task of analyzing each response and placing it in tabulated form.

The teacher-principal responses were organized into five categories: (1) organizational structure of, the frequency of, and methods used in regular organized in-service meetings concerned with the elementary evaluative criteria; (2) how the elementary evaluative criteria were helpful in suggesting ways to improve teacher efficiency; (3) the ways in which the elementary evaluative criteria

helped to motivate teachers to make personal preparations for periodic self-evaluation; (4) how the in-service meetings which were concerned with the elementary evaluative criteria were of help in improving teacher efficiency; and (5) general considerations or suggestions pertaining to the elementary evaluative criteria or the in-service meetings concerned with the evaluative criteria.

III. ORGANIZATION OF REMAINDER OF THE STUDY

This report is organized under four main headings:

(1) statement of the problem and procedure--Chapter I, (2) review of literature pertaining to in-service education through self-evaluation based on evaluative criteria--Chapter II, (3) an analysis of the responses to the questionnaires--Chapter III, and (4) conclusions and recommendations--Chapter IV.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Self-evaluative instruments have been relatively new tools in education. Thirty years ago, appraisal techniques were highly experimental, and the handful of persons developing them were pioneering in virgin territory. During the late 1930's and especially since 1940, the term gained wide currency. Despite the frequency with which it is used, or perhaps because of its popularity, the term "self-evaluation" has failed to acquire a clear-cut single meaning among many members of the teaching profession. For the purposes of this paper the definition according to Shane and McSwain was used:

Self-evaluation is a process of inquiry based upon criteria cooperatively prepared and concerned with the study, interpretation and guidance of socially desirable changes in the developmental behavior of children.¹

Many manuals, checklists, handbooks, guides, and books have been written concerning the basis, purpose, procedures, and history of self-evaluation for the improvement of elementary schools. This chapter serves only as a brief summary of this literature.

¹Harold G. Shane and E. T. McSwain, Evaluation and the Elementary Curriculum (New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1958), p. 3.

I. THE HISTORICAL EVOLUTION OF ELEMENTARY EVALUATIVE CRITERIA

The concept of evaluation was a phase of man's continuing effort to apply intelligence to the rational solution of his problems. In this sense it was undoubtedly indebted to philosophy for its contributions with regard to what Butler, writing of pragmatism, has called a "new logic adequate for the science and culture of our time . . ."1 This form of inquiry, closely associated with the writings of John Dewey, was based upon the experimental method as a means of recounciling present day applied science techniques and the "everyday commonsense inquiry of home, field, and market place."2

Dewey's pattern or method of inquiry may be studied in his Logic: The Theory of Inquiry.3 It consisted of five basic steps: activity, problem, observation of data, formulation of hypothesis, and testing of hypothesis. The steps in all evaluative processes in some ways resemble this

1J. Donald Butler, Four Philosophies and Their Practice in Education and Religion (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1951), p. 439.

2Ibid.

3John Dewey, Logic: The Theory of Inquiry (New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1938), p. 428.

pattern.¹

Evaluation as a procedure has been indebted to science as well as to philosophy. In appraisal processes many elements have been closely akin to the steps in the scientific method for sensing problems and for formulating and testing hypotheses. Slavson and Speer described the "search-discovery technique" in elementary school science. They noted that:

Its chief characteristic consists in the fact that the pupils are led by the environment--the problems and activities which it stimulates--to discover (1) scientific facts and (2) the need for such information.²

Their description of the application of search-discovery as suggested by the scientific method, "a method of pupil initiation and pupil participation, and of pupil initiation and pupil execution,"³ in many ways anticipated current self-evaluative procedures in which teachers and children share.

The concept of evaluation has been helped to mature particularly by two forces on the educational scene: (1) the scientific movement and (2) the recent insights into the

¹J. Wayne Wrightstone, "Evaluation," Encyclopedia of Educational Research, Walter S. Monroe, editor (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1950), p. 403.

²S. R. Slavson and Robert K. Speer, Science in the New Education (New York: Prentice-Hall, 1934), p. 301.

³Ibid.

nature of child development.

The scientific movement influenced evaluation significantly by providing many tools and measurement techniques which subsequently became of use in evaluative appraisal. These include intelligence and achievement batteries and a wide variety of tests of performance, aptitude, and so forth. The movement also contributed indirectly to evaluation by motivating certain educators to seek more comprehensive means of gaging the work of the school than were originally provided for by older types of testing instruments.

Research in the field of child development urged upon educators the need to re-examine their values as knowledge accumulated. This scrutiny of values led to dissatisfaction. For example, the following sampling of a few newer emphases in classroom procedures are representative of elements that suggested the need for new bases in appraising educational outcomes:

1. First-hand experiences for children.
2. The concept of child needs and interests.
3. Increased use of teaching aids.
4. Community service by the school.
5. The role of emotion in learning.
6. Growing recognition of the importance of practicing democracy in the classroom.
7. Changing knowledge regarding the I.Q.
8. Acceptance of the need to improve human relations in classroom and community.¹

¹Shane and McSwain, op. cit., pp. 406-407.

As new theories and the practices to which they pointed gained acceptance, different means had to be found to determine what constituted "successful" teaching and learning. In this sense recent educational trends helped evaluation to make the start it has made in superseding more narrow means of judging the work of the school.

Much credit has been due J. Wayne Wrightstone, E. R. Smith, and Ralph W. Tyler for their pioneering attempts in the field of evaluation in the last three decades. In 1935 Wrightstone reported on his efforts to appraise "newer-type" and "standard-type" school practices in a volume which continues to be of influence.¹ Probably because of the persistent criticisms directed at so-called "progressive" schools, Wrightstone set himself the task of comparing the outcomes of instruction in a number of New York City area schools. A portion of the significance of his efforts resided in his creativeness in setting out to gauge what was generally considered elements too subjective for measuring.

In the process he obtained descriptions of experimental practices; designed instruments to appraise attitudes, adjustment, and social performance; and made use of

¹J. Wayne Wrightstone, An Appraisal of Newer Practices in Selected Public Schools (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1935), p. 112.

subject matter tests. The results of this investigation were encouraging to school people in the "newer-type" elementary schools for Wrightstone was able to conclude that "in the areas of intelligence factors, dynamic factors, and social performance factors, as they were measured in the study, the new-type schools were superior."¹ Much subsequent experimentation bears the mark of the influence of his approaches.²

The Eight-Year Study, sometimes called the Thirty School Experiment, was begun in the early 1930's and held as its general purpose the improvement of the high schools' service to the American youth.

The Thirty School Experiment was primarily concerned with ascertaining how a large number of students who went through contrasting high school curricula fared during their college years. One of the two divided, but comparable, groups followed a program which met the conventional college entrance requirements; the other was permitted to enter higher education without satisfying requirements other than those set up by the professional judgment of the staffs of the thirty schools. Development by teachers of the most

¹Ibid., p. 113.

²J. Wayne Wrightstone, "Evaluation of the Experiment With the Activity Program in New York City Elementary Schools," Journal of Educational Research, XXXVIII (December, 1934), 252-257.

creative learning experiences they could devise was done without concern for the controls established by colleges and universities, such as entrance examinations, units of credit, and specified majors.

The challenge confronting the evaluation staff in this experiment was to design instruments which would measure successfully the progress which students made toward the high schools' goals. According to Smith and Tyler, the following major objectives were those for which new measuring tools were needed:

1. The development of effective methods of thinking.
2. The cultivation of useful work habits and study skills.
3. The inculcation of social attitudes.
4. The acquisition of a wide range of significant interests.
5. The development of increased appreciation of esthetic experiences.
6. The development of social sensitivity.
7. The development of better personal-social adjustment.
8. The acquisition of important information.
9. The development of physical health.
10. The development of a consistent philosophy of life.¹

The success of the staff in analyzing such elements or qualities probably provided the greatest intellectual stimulus to appraisal practices that they have yet received.

The work of the committee for the Cooperative Study of Secondary School Standards provided a third milestone in

¹E. R. Smith and Ralph W. Tyler, Appraising and Recording Student Progress (New York: Harper Brothers, 1942), pp. 16-18.

evaluation.¹ Shortly after the Progressive Education Association launched the Eight-Year Study, this committee began its efforts to devise a useful instrument which would help school people clarify their objectives at the high school level and appraise the degree of their success in achieving them.²

An intensive study was made of the problem from 1933 to 1939. One outcome of these labors was what was probably the most comprehensive single instrument for evaluation now in use: the Evaluative Criteria. This sizeable device consists of numerous scales, conversion tables, and so forth, which are used by a visiting committee invited to evaluate a school. The appraisal often lasts for several days and, when concluded, provides an over-all view of the school's program with regard to its success in providing adequate leadership and resources for learning. Appraisals involving the use of the Evaluative Criteria have proved especially useful since 1940 in stimulating local staff discussion in helping to redirect the reorganization of secondary education. The instrument, which is difficult to

¹Committee for the Cooperative Study of Secondary School Standards, Evaluative Criteria (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1950).

²"Evaluation in the Secondary School," Bulletin of the Department of Secondary School Principals, XXXII (April, 1948), 154.

use, has nevertheless been found rewarding.

Like many another field, evaluation lost some of its momentum during World War II. Perhaps some of the initial impact of the Thirty Schools Experiment was dissipated because efforts to implement its findings were forced to compete with the schools' wartime efforts. The use of the Evaluative Criteria was also hampered by travel restrictions and defense activities which absorbed educators' time and energies after 1941. By 1950 there was strong evidence that evaluation had again hit its stride. Many projects were once more under way. Public educational systems throughout the country extended, revised, or constructed new evaluative criteria to include their elementary schools. Self-evaluative instruments and procedures such as the Texas Handbook for Appraisal and Improvement of Elementary Schools, Evaluation Manual for the Improvement of Oklahoma Elementary Schools, Elementary Evaluative Criteria for Boston Schools, Evaluation Handbook for St. Louis Public Schools, Ohio Elementary School Standards, Standards for Elementary Schools in Oregon, Elementary Evaluative Criteria for Use in Des Moines Public Elementary Schools document this statement.

It seems altogether reasonable to conclude that the next decade will witness an even more important role played by self-appraisal procedures in elementary education.

II. THE BASES OF IN-SERVICE EDUCATION THROUGH THE USE OF ELEMENTARY EVALUATIVE CRITERIA

Certain educators have condemned the idea of comprehensive evaluation of schools with claims that:

Objective measurements or tests become the end and purpose of instruction and subjective instruments such as evaluative criteria cannot offer valid evidence from which reform judgements may be made.¹

Some of the proponents of evaluation, on the other hand, have made claims that "progress in education is one-sided and practically impossible without both objective and subjective evidence."² It was this group of educators who pointed out that: "Reform and evaluation are not opponents; rather, they are different and co-ordinate aspects of experimentation and thus have a basis in our educational system."³

Wrightstone has been a proponent of a number of hypotheses upon which current practices in self-evaluation have been based.

The first hypothesis was that "curricular change and

¹J. Wayne Wrightstone, Appraisal of Newer School Practices (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1938), p. 152.

²John Dewey, The Sources of a Science of Education (New York: Horace Liveright, 1929), p. 136.

³Ibid., p. 137.

evaluation were co-ordinate aspects of true experimentation."¹ The end result of both was to provide more insight and richness for the reconstruction of pupil personalities. The evaluation, therefore, must have been compatible with purposes toward which the curricular change was to contribute.

A resolution concurrent with the aforementioned hypothesis was made by Oklahoma educators who stated that "items in self-appraisal tools were developed in consistency with results of educational research and were based on the best judgment of leaders in elementary education."² Evaluative checklists based on such items were deemed, by the Oklahoma educators, as "basic to the experimental approach toward school improvement."³

A second hypothesis was that "a program of evaluation must have been comprehensive."⁴ It should not be limited to a few isolated goals, or objectives, but should include all

¹Wrightstone, Appraisal of Newer School Practices, p. 152.

²Oklahoma Curriculum Improvement Commission, Evaluation Manual for the Improvement of Elementary Schools, An Evaluative Instrument Prepared by Oklahoma Educators (Oklahoma City: Oklahoma Curriculum Improvement Commission, 1958), p. 6.

³Ibid.

⁴Wrightstone, Appraisal of Newer School Practices, p. 152.

major objectives of instruction.

A clearer recognition on the part of the Des Moines elementary school teachers of elementary school program deficiencies was believed attainable through the use of elementary evaluative criteria which was "based upon factors sufficient in number and variety to give valid evidence of the extent to which the school program has been attaining the goals formulated."¹

A third hypothesis was that "for a variety of major objectives of instruction no adequate methods or instruments for collecting reliable evidence have been available."²

Until valid and reliable techniques have been evolved, many educational objectives must be appraised by as careful subjective means as possible.³ Six factors were stated as being strategic influences upon subjective self-evaluation:

1. Professional attitude.
2. Scientific attitude.
3. Ability to maintain a healthy emotional climate.

¹Des Moines Public Schools, Elementary Evaluative Criteria, An Evaluative Instrument Prepared by Des Moines Elementary Principals (Des Moines, Iowa: Des Moines Public Schools, 1962), p. 6.

²Wrightstone, Appraisal of Newer School Practices, p. 153.

³Bernard J. Lonsdale and Afton D. Nance, "Evaluating the Elementary School," California Educational Journal, XXX (May, 1961), p. 76.

4. Ability to plan, organize, and execute efficiently.
5. Ability to analyze situations and anticipate needs.
6. Courage to face reality and seek help when needed.¹

A fourth hypothesis was that "a variety of means and techniques must be used for collecting evidence."² These might have ranged from pencil and paper tests, ratings, anecdotal records, and controlled observation techniques to physiological devices. New techniques were to be developed and old techniques revised to meet new needs.

Elementary school ratings derived from teacher self-evaluations were to function solely as co-ordinate determinates of curricular needs.³ Standardized test results, physical education skills, the child's access to and use of the central school library, and accumulating samples of students' written work were but a few of the additional techniques of collecting evaluative evidence employed in St. Louis Public Elementary Schools.⁴

The Department of Public Instruction in Pennsylvania proposed that only a planned evaluation of all the factors

¹Des Moines Public Schools, loc. cit.

²Wrightstone, Appraisal of Newer School Practices, p. 153.

³St. Louis Public Schools, Evaluation Handbook for Elementary Schools, An Evaluative Instrument Prepared by St. Louis Educators (St. Louis, Missouri: St. Louis Public Schools, 1952), p. 3.

⁴Ibid.

and resources which affect the school's program using diversified means can reveal the program's unique strengths and existing weaknesses.¹

A fifth hypothesis was that "the measures should correspond to functional units of pupil behavior in actual curricular situations rather than isolated units of behavior drawn from clinical investigations."² Too often the results of special clinical investigations have been transferred to the classroom and accepted as valid guides for influencing behavior.

Graduate students attending Boston University expressed a similar philosophy when they stated that "evaluation is possible if the school is evaluated in terms of its own philosophy and objectives which, in turn, must be consistent with pupil needs."³ Only from such valid evaluation should a staff incorporate the important needs and improvements which appear to be desirable.

A sixth hypothesis was that "reliable and valid

¹Department of Public Instruction, How Good Is Your Program?, A Report Prepared by Pennsylvania Educators (Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Department of Public Instruction, 1957), p. 1.

²Wrightstone, Appraisal of Newer School Practices, p. 153.

³Boston University, Elementary Evaluative Criteria, An Evaluative Instrument Prepared by Graduate Students (Boston: Boston University Press, 1953), p. 2.

objective instruments of measurement are by their very nature restricted to an appraisal of limited pupil behavior."¹

Ragan stated that "it is impossible to measure the whole result of an educative experience by any one instrument."²

Through measuring many vital aspects of educative experiences with varied instruments, Shane stated that "some valid appraisals may be obtained of the relative merits of diverse educational practices."³

A seventh hypothesis was that "measures of functional behavior can best be developed by teachers working in cooperation with technicians who concern themselves with construction of such instruments."⁴

Concerning this principle, an evaluation committee was appointed as the co-ordinator of the St. Louis in-service self-evaluative program. Committee members were

¹Wrightstone, Appraisal of Newer School Practices, p. 153.

²William B. Ragan, Modern Elementary Curriculum (New York: Dryden Press, 1960), p. 114.

³Harold G. Shane, "Recent Developments in Elementary School Evaluation," Journal of Educational Research, LIV (March, 1951), 436.

⁴Wrightstone, Appraisal of Newer School Practices, p. 153.

released from other duties so that they might, with the help of teachers, effectively deal as specialists with the construction of an evaluative instrument and the implementation and improvement of such a program of improvement.¹

Elsbree and McNally proposed six hypotheses, two of which extended beyond those of Wrightstone.

The first hypothesis was that "evaluation should be diagnostic in nature."²

Diagnostic evaluation was the fundamental stated purpose of the Boston University Elementary Evaluative Criteria.³ The underlying philosophy of the instrument was in harmony with Elsbree and McNally's statement:

Unless one goes back of opinions, ratings and value judgements and attempts to identify reasons and influencing factors, the evaluation can be of little help to the teachers. For this reason, the group should strive to document each evaluation, and think through to the implications of the causes.⁴

The second hypothesis was that "evaluation should be continuous."⁵

Evaluation in the modern program of improvement has

¹St. Louis Public Schools, op. cit., p. 4.

²Willard S. Elsbree and Harold J. McNally, Elementary School Administration and Supervision (second edition; New York: American Book Co., 1959), p. 189.

³Boston University, op. cit., p. 5.

⁴Elsbree and McNally, loc. cit.

⁵Ibid.

continuously strived for school program improvement however gradual that improvement might have been. As was stated in the Boston University Elementary Evaluative Criteria:

Evaluation studies are usually followed by continued in-service work in light of identified needs. . . . The attempts to solve all problems or to carry out all recommendations within a short period of time would undoubtedly result in chaos. . . . Results of evaluations usually point the way to organized in-service activities for at least a three- to five-year period.¹

A summation of the documented hypotheses derived from the reviewed literature upon which current practices in self-evaluation have been based is:

1. Curricular change and evaluation were co-ordinate aspects of true experimentation.
2. A program of evaluation must have been comprehensive.
3. For a variety of major objectives of instruction no adequate methods or instruments for collecting reliable evidence have been available.
4. A variety of means and techniques must be used for collecting evidence.
5. The measures should correspond to functional units of pupil behavior in actual curricular situations rather than isolated units of behavior drawn from clinical investigations.
6. Reliable and valid objective instruments of measurement are by their very nature restricted to an appraisal of limited pupil behavior.
7. Measures of functional behavior can best be developed by teachers working in cooperation with technicians who concern themselves with construction of such instruments.
8. Evaluation should be diagnostic in nature.
9. Evaluation should be continuous.²

¹Boston University, loc. cit.

²Wrightstone, Appraisal of Newer School Practices, pp. 152-153; and Elsbree and McNally, loc. cit.

III. THE PURPOSES OF IN-SERVICE EDUCATION THROUGH THE USE OF ELEMENTARY EVALUATIVE CRITERIA

Thus far in the discussion of related literature, there has been no direct statement of the purposes of in-service education through the use of elementary evaluative criteria. The statement of the Connecticut Department of Education held that the major and long range objective of all programs for professional growth should be the improvement of the citizens of the community.¹ However, in order to realize this major objective, there must be more specific and realistic purposes of an immediate nature. Elsbree and McNally propounded that the objectives of self-evaluative in-service programs were identifying weaknesses and problems in the school program, and the development of effective methods of working on such deficiencies.²

The California Elementary School Administrators Association proposed that "a chief objective is to help the teacher develop an attitude of self-evaluation and improvement . . ."³

¹Connecticut State Department of Education, How to Recognize A Good Elementary School, A Guide for Evaluation of Connecticut Elementary Schools, Bulletin 68 (Hartford, Connecticut: Bureau of School and Community Services, January, 1956), p. 17.

²Elsbree and McNally, op. cit., p. 186.

³California Elementary School Administrators Associa-

A statement in Is Yours an Excellent School? extended the belief that "a major task confronting teacher education is the building of a creative approach to the solution of the problems of teaching."¹

The Oregon State Board of Education felt that "in-service self-evaluative procedures provide a certain psychological security to the school staff, the pupils, and to the parents, as to whether the school was accomplishing its major objectives."²

Principals who initiated the evaluative program in Des Moines hoped that "teacher purposes would be clarified and that teachers would see more concretely the direction they were moving."³

Herrick stressed the purposes that self-evaluative in-service programs provided a sound basis for public

tion, The Characteristics of the Good Elementary School, A Study Prepared by California Elementary School Administrators (San Francisco: California Elementary School Administrators Association, 1957), p. 7.

¹Teacher Education Workshop, Is Yours an Excellent School? (Nashville, Tennessee: George Peabody College for Teachers, 1948), p. 3.

²State Department of Education, Standards for Elementary Schools in Oregon (Salem, Oregon: State Department of Education, 1959), p. 5.

³Des Moines Public Schools, Elementary Evaluative Criteria, An Evaluative Instrument Prepared by Des Moines Elementary Principals (Des Moines, Iowa: Des Moines Public Schools, 1962), p. vi.

relations and that these procedures have been used to validate the hypothesis upon which the institution operates.¹

In short, then, some purposes revealed by the literature on in-service education through self-evaluation are:

1. To identify weaknesses and problems in the school program.
2. To develop effective creative methods of working in school program deficiencies.
3. To develop an attitude of self-evaluation and improvement.
4. To provide security as to whether the school was accomplishing its major purposes.
5. To clarify teacher purpose and direction.
6. To validate the hypothesis upon which the school operates.
7. To provide a sound basis for public relations.

IV. THE PROCEDURES OF IN-SERVICE EDUCATION THROUGH THE UTILIZATION OF ELEMENTARY EVALUATIVE CRITERIA

With the principles of bases and purposes in mind, brief attention was given to some procedures that have been

¹Virgil E. Herrick, Issues in Elementary Education (Minneapolis, Minnesota: Burgess Publishing Co., 1954), p. 191.

used in planning and conducting programs of self-appraisal. Such principles must be regarded as suggestive only, and not all-inclusive. Obviously, the need of modification and development might arise to meet given situations.

The administrative staff in charge of in-service education has the responsibility of initial formulation of policies and plans pertaining to the appraisal of school programs.¹ A reservation would be that as the appraisal program progresses enthusiasm for the work on the part of the participant would increase as its values became more apparent, thereby decreasing proportionally administrative responsibility.²

The board of education should consider and adopt policies pertaining to such appraisal.³ The purposes, procedures, and their school system's particular need of a self-evaluative program require explanation before a meeting of the board, each member having been given a copy of the intended manual, if one has been constructed, for his leisurely perusal.⁴ At a later date a definite program may

¹Egar L. Morphet, Roe L. Johns, and Theodore L. Reller, Educational Administration Concepts, Practices, and Issues (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1959), p. 535.

²Boston University, op. cit., p. 11.

³Morphet, Johns, and Reller, loc. cit.

⁴Texas State Department of Education, Handbook for

be submitted to the board for formal approval. Such submission might contain the general and specific purposes, the role of the staff and outside consultants, the release of staff members for participation, the provisions for the cost of such a program, and the methods of reporting the appraisal results.¹ The program of school improvement submitted may be of short- or long-term duration. The superintendent of schools might assume a major role in the presentation.

Involvement of the staff should be sought, but careful attention is to be given to the nature of the involvement.² The various members participating must show competence in their area of involvement, be interested in the work, and be capable of developing skill in making a cooperative effort.

Membership on a suggested steering committee responsible for organization of the evaluative program should provide representation of both administrative and instructional personnel who are particularly adept in this area.³

Self-Appraisal and Improvement of Elementary Schools, An Evaluative Instrument Prepared by Texas Educators (Austin, Texas: Texas State Department of Education, 1948), p. xiv.

¹Ibid. ²Morphet, Johns, and Reller, loc. cit.

³Oklahoma Curriculum Improvement Commission, Evaluation Manual for the Improvement of Elementary Schools, An Evaluative Instrument Prepared by Oklahoma Educators (Oklahoma City: Oklahoma Curriculum Improvement Commission, 1958), p. 7.

Steering committee members then serve as leaders on two other types of committees, major section and instructional area committees.¹ Major area committees, which involve additional competent members of the staff, are responsible for developing a statement of philosophy and objectives for evaluation of such areas as guidance services, school plant, and school staff and administration. The instructional area committees that envelop additional competent staff members are responsible for evaluation of such aspects of the educational program as arithmetic, language arts, social studies, and the like.

Upon completion of the work of the steering, major section, and instructional area committees, provision is made for leadership in the individual school. The principal is usually designated as the most competent building representative to initiate the program in the school.² One or more of the following methods are suggested:

1. The conducting of a meeting concerned with the values of self-appraisal in a program of school evaluation.³
2. A committee of teachers plan with the principal the ways of using the criteria in their particular

¹Ibid. ²Des Moines Public Schools, op. cit., p. viii.

³Des Moines Public Schools, loc. cit.

program of self-improvement.¹

3. Presentation of the problems of self-appraisal before a regularly scheduled building meeting.²
4. Discussion of the program at an open meeting such as P. T. A.³
5. Informal visits between teachers and principals.⁴

After the introductory stage it is hoped that divergent staff leadership for the following regularly scheduled meetings will emerge.⁵ Morphet, Johns, and Reller thought that certain staff members prove to be valuable participants in one role and less valuable contributors in another.⁶ To take advantage of these personal differences, elementary schools organize into a committee of the whole to study each section of the manual and to arrive at a group evaluation for each of the items in each section of the criteria.⁷ Teachers then serve periodically and voluntarily as presiding officers or leaders and employ varying methods to

¹Ibid.

²Texas State Department of Education, op. cit., p. xv.

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Connecticut State Department of Education, op. cit., p. 7.

⁶Morphet, Johns, and Reller, op. cit., p. 536.

⁷Des Moines Public Schools, op. cit., p. vi.

enlighten other committee members on each curricular area being evaluated.¹

It may be necessary to state clearly the desired role to be played by consultants.² Invitation may be extended to consultants from the supervisory staff of the school system, from the teacher education institutions of the area, or from other school systems. The arousing of more interest in curriculum improvement, an increase in objectivity on the part of teachers when evaluating the program, and special knowledge and resources brought to bear on a problem are all aims of this action.³ Caution is to be taken to make the best use of the consultant's time. Domination of the meeting and solution of staff problems is not the role of the consultant.⁴ They are only to function as advisors to the staff.

Implementation of recommendations proposed during the course of the study must be done periodically as the committees have finished their work or at the close of each evaluation.⁵ Reports might be given to the entire staff

¹Des Moines Public Schools, loc. cit.

²Texas State Department of Education, loc. cit.

³Morphet, Johns, and Reller, loc. cit.

⁴St. Louis Public Schools, op. cit., p. 5.

⁵Boston University, loc. cit.

indicating significant strengths and weaknesses pertaining to the area evaluated. Suggestions for improvement resulting from these reports might be forthcoming. The staff must be selective at this point for if all needs and recommendations are attempted in a short time span, chaos would result.¹ Suggestion is made that improvements which can be incorporated quickly and legally would be a desirable starting place.²

Some person or committee should be charged with the responsibility of reporting the plans and progress of the continuous self-appraisal program.³ Reporting is not likely to be done unless responsibility is affixed. Anxiety on the part of many people must be overcome through frank presentation of purposes and plans.⁴ This presentation also facilitates the high level of cooperation that is necessary to this type of evaluation.⁵

¹Ibid.

²Ibid.

³Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, Evaluating the Elementary School (Atlanta, Georgia: Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, 1951), p. 325.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Ibid.

CHAPTER III

QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

This chapter presents the responses of teachers and principals to the questionnaires concerning the effectiveness of the Des Moines public school system's in-service self-evaluative program.

A group of 145 elementary teachers--seventeen per cent of the total 824.5 elementary teachers employed in the Des Moines public schools--were polled. Of this group, 118, or eighty-one per cent, returned questionnaires. This was fourteen per cent of the elementary teaching staff.

The entire staff, or one hundred per cent, of the forty-eight elementary building principals was included in the survey. Thirteen of the forty-eight principals were the administrative heads of two schools and were to complete separate questionnaires for each of the twenty-six schools they represented. Thus, sixty-one elementary schools were to be represented. Responses to the questionnaire gave a representation of eighty-nine per cent of the buildings. Principal responses were herein dealt with as though they had come from different and separate principals, thereby resulting in a count of sixty-one elementary principals.

The responses have been organized around the following five headings:

1. Organizational structure of, frequency of, and methods employed in in-service building meetings concerned with self-evaluation.
2. The ways in which regular organized in-service meetings concerned with elementary evaluative criteria were of help in improving teacher efficiency.
3. The ways in which the elementary evaluative criteria helped to motivate teachers to make personal preparations for periodic self-evaluation.
4. How the elementary evaluative criteria which were included in the evaluative program were helpful in suggesting ways to improve teacher efficiency.
5. General considerations or suggestions of the teachers and principals participating that pertained to the elementary evaluative criteria or the in-service building meetings which were based upon elementary evaluative criteria.

The final section of this chapter serves as a summary.

I. THE STRUCTURE OF, FREQUENCY OF, AND METHODS EMPLOYED IN IN-SERVICE BUILDING MEETINGS CONCERNED WITH SELF-EVALUATION

The question concerned with in-service evaluative

meetings that principals alone were asked to respond to was:

If you conducted a regular organized program of in-service meetings concerned with the elementary evaluative criteria, briefly summarize below the methods used.

Of the fifty-four respondents, forty-nine, or ninety-one per cent, replied to the initial question. The forty-nine responses represented eighty per cent of the elementary buildings in Des Moines.

In regard to organizational structure of the in-service evaluative meetings, the forty-nine reporting principals stated as follows:

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Per cent</u>
The principal presided over the introductory meeting.	49	100
The teachers voluntarily assumed responsibility for conducting evaluative meetings of their chosen curricular areas in grades k-6.	47	96
Specific grade level evaluations in addition to general k-6 evaluations were made.	3	6
The principal presided over a small portion of each evaluative meeting.	3	6
No teacher, group of teachers, or principal was officially charged with leadership.	2	4

Concerning frequency of meetings, the principals reported:

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Per cent</u>
Monthly evaluative meetings were held.	47	96

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Per cent</u>
Irregular evaluative meetings concerned with a school's weakest curricular areas were held.	2	4

In reference to the methods utilized in in-service evaluative meetings, principals replied:

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Per cent</u>
Teacher committees led the faculty in discussion of the curricular area being evaluated.	40	82
Consultants, guest speakers, and resource people were used.	18	37
Faculty discussion was based upon emergent leadership.	12	25
Teacher role playing, children, films, panels, exhibits, question and answer periods, demonstrations and teacher-made visuals were used.	8	16
A teacher-principal conference was held following the teacher's self-evaluation.	2	4
Teacher committees compiled results of self-evaluation and made recommendations for program improvement.	2	4

II. THE WAYS IN WHICH REGULAR ORGANIZED IN-SERVICE MEETINGS CONCERNED WITH THE ELEMENTARY EVALUATIVE CRITERIA WERE OF HELP IN IMPROVING TEACHER EFFICIENCY

The group of 145 elementary teachers were asked to respond to this question:

If regular organized in-service meetings concerned with the elementary evaluative criteria were conducted

in your school, how were these meetings of help in improving your efficiency as a teacher?

Response to this particular question was secured from 118 elementary teachers, or eighty-one per cent of the 145 teachers polled.

All principals were asked to respond to a similar question:

In what ways have you seen staff improvement that you contribute to regular organized in-service meetings concerned with the evaluative criteria?

Responses were secured from fifty-four, or eighty-nine per cent, of the elementary principals.

In regard to the ways that the in-service meetings helped to increase teacher efficiency, principals and teachers stated as follows:

	<u>PRINCIPALS</u>		<u>TEACHERS</u>	
	<u>Num-</u> <u>ber</u>	<u>Per</u> <u>cent</u>	<u>Num-</u> <u>ber</u>	<u>Per</u> <u>cent</u>
The necessity of staff participation and co-operation in evaluation was clearer.	42	78	88	75
The role of the elementary school in the total educational program was clearer.	32	59	77	65
Deficiencies present in an elementary school program were recognized.	40	74	71	60
New ways to attack deficient areas of an elementary school program were found.	31	57	57	48
Knowledge and skill in evaluation were improved.	30	56	61	52

	<u>PRINCIPALS</u>		<u>TEACHERS</u>	
	<u>Num-</u> <u>ber</u>	<u>Per</u> <u>cent</u>	<u>Num-</u> <u>ber</u>	<u>Per</u> <u>cent</u>
The role of the particular grade or subject in the total elementary curriculum was clearer.	43	80	85	72
Various aids and guides a teacher might enlist toward enlightenment were utilized.	34	63	72	61
The need for teacher responsibility for leadership in the continuous evaluation of the elementary school was recognized.	37	69	71	60
Better use and appreciation of staff talents was a result.	2	4	0	0
The in-service meetings were of no help in improving teacher efficiency.	0	0	4	3

III. THE WAYS IN WHICH THE ELEMENTARY EVALUATIVE CRITERIA HELPED TO MOTIVATE TEACHERS TO MAKE PERSONAL PREPARATIONS FOR PERIODIC SELF-EVALUATION

The group of 145 elementary teachers were asked to respond to this question:

In what ways did the elementary evaluative criteria help to motivate you to make personal preparations for periodic self-evaluation?

Response to this question was secured from 118 elementary teachers, or eighty-one per cent of the 145 teachers polled.

All principals were asked to respond to a similar

question:

In what ways have you seen staff improvement that you can contribute to the elementary evaluative criteria which were utilized in regular organized in-service meetings?

Responses were secured from fifty-four, or eighty-nine per cent, of the elementary principals.

In regard to the ways the criteria motivated teachers to make personal preparations for self-evaluation, principals and teachers reported:

	<u>PRINCIPALS</u>		<u>TEACHERS</u>	
	<u>Num-</u> <u>ber</u>	<u>Per</u> <u>cent</u>	<u>Num-</u> <u>ber</u>	<u>Per</u> <u>cent</u>
A re-evaluation of a curricular area in light of the total elementary school program.	26	48	54	46
Exchanges of ideas between teachers and principals.	41	76	86	73
Exchanges of ideas between teachers.	45	83	105	89
Staff preparation through preparatory readings in professional literature.	27	50	54	46
Increased study of aids, manuals, and texts pertaining to the elementary program.	31	57	74	63
Objective analyzation of past experiences and anticipation of needs.	22	41	66	56
Psychological preparation on the part of the individual or the staff to make valid and reliable evaluations.	14	26	56	48
A thorough study of the evaluative criteria.	27	50	54	46

	<u>PRINCIPALS</u>		<u>TEACHERS</u>	
	<u>Num-</u> <u>ber</u>	<u>Per</u> <u>cent</u>	<u>Num-</u> <u>ber</u>	<u>Per</u> <u>cent</u>
The elementary evaluative criteria did not serve as a motivating force.	0	0	3	3

IV. HOW THE ELEMENTARY EVALUATIVE CRITERIA WHICH WERE INCLUDED IN THE EVALUATIVE PROGRAM WERE HELPFUL IN SUGGESTING WAYS TO IMPROVE TEACHER EFFICIENCY

The group of 145 elementary teachers were asked to respond to this question:

How were the elementary evaluative criteria which were included in the elementary evaluative program helpful in suggesting ways to improve your efficiency as a teacher?

Response to this question was secured from 118 elementary teachers, or eighty-one per cent of the 145 elementary teachers polled.

All principals were asked to respond to a similar question:

In what ways have you seen staff improvement that you can contribute to the elementary evaluative criteria which were utilized in regular organized in-service meetings?

Responses were secured from fifty-four, or eighty-nine per cent, of the elementary principals.

Concerning the ways the elementary evaluative criteria were helpful in suggesting ways to improve teacher efficiency, principals and teachers reported:

	<u>PRINCIPALS</u>		<u>TEACHERS</u>	
	<u>Num-</u> <u>ber</u>	<u>Per</u> <u>cent</u>	<u>Num-</u> <u>ber</u>	<u>Per</u> <u>cent</u>
Definite and realistic views of attainable goals toward which to strive were clearer.	27	50	83	70
A clearer recognition of areas of strengths and weaknesses in an elementary school program was gained.	37	69	94	79
The criteria served as a guide for making even more frequent personal evaluations.	32	59	65	55
Suggestion of the need for personal and building evaluation was made.	31	57	75	64
The role of the elementary school curriculum in the total educational program was suggested.	32	59	73	62
Systematic and definite instruction was suggested.	30	56	66	57
The criteria were not helpful in suggesting ways to improve teacher efficiency.	0	0	2	2

V. GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS OR SUGGESTIONS OF THE TEACHERS AND PRINCIPALS PARTICIPATING IN THE SURVEY THAT PERTAINED TO THE ELEMENTARY EVALUATIVE CRITERIA OR THE IN-SERVICE BUILDING MEETINGS WHICH WERE BASED UPON ELEMENTARY EVALUATIVE CRITERIA

All sixty-one principals and 145 elementary teachers were asked to respond to this question:

Do you have any general considerations or suggestions pertaining to the evaluative criteria or the in-service meetings concerned with the evaluative criteria?

Responses to this question were secured from twenty-nine, or fifty-four per cent, of the fifty-four principal respondents and eleven, or nine per cent, of the 118 teacher respondents.

In reference to general considerations or suggestions that pertained to the elementary evaluative criteria or the in-service meetings which were based upon the elementary evaluative criteria, principals and teachers replied as follows:

	<u>PRINCIPALS</u>		<u>TEACHERS</u>	
	<u>Num-</u> <u>ber</u>	<u>Per</u> <u>cent</u>	<u>Num-</u> <u>ber</u>	<u>Per</u> <u>cent</u>
The criteria were deserving of more time than was available due to teacher load and other in-service commitments.	13	45	4	36
The in-service evaluative meetings were valuable and well received.	10	35	4	36
A curricular area needs concentrated evaluation for periods of time longer than one month.	5	17	3	27
There was increased recognition of staff leadership and creative abilities.	3	10	0	0
The teachers charged with evaluative meeting leadership gained the most from that meeting.	3	10	0	0

	<u>PRINCIPALS</u>		<u>TEACHERS</u>	
	<u>Num-</u> <u>ber</u>	<u>Per</u> <u>cent</u>	<u>Num-</u> <u>ber</u>	<u>Per</u> <u>cent</u>
There was increased staff awareness of what is being done before and after their grade level of work.	2	7	0	0
Selection of fewer curricular areas to be evaluated during a one-year period might prove worthy of consideration.	2	7	0	0
Criteria must be assayed with the method devised by the staff to meet their needs.	1	4	1	9
In co-ordination with the evaluation, studies of curriculum used in and out of the state might be made.	1	4	1	9
There should be city-wide staff evaluation for city-wide improvement.	1	4	1	9
Television might lend itself to city-wide meetings concerned with self-evaluation.	1	4	0	0
Other school problems suffered because of time spent on in-service evaluation.	1	4	0	0
Area meetings concerned with evaluation of selected curricular areas might be held.	1	4	0	0
Better methods for marking strengths and weaknesses might be devised.	1	4	0	0
Representative teachers from the system might have helped to construct the criteria.	1	4	0	0

VI. SUMMARY

The greater number of responding principals reported that the in-service evaluative meetings:

1. Had been presided over by the principal in the introductory stage.
2. Had been held monthly as was suggested by the calendar constructed by the administration.
3. Had been led voluntarily by teachers or teacher committees.
4. Had been based upon faculty discussion of the curricular area being evaluated and the use of consultants, guest speakers, and resource people.

Over seventy per cent of both reporting teachers and principals agreed that the criteria or the in-service evaluative meetings had:

1. Made the necessity of staff participation and cooperation in evaluation clearer.
2. Made clearer the role of the particular grade or subject in the total elementary curriculum.
3. Made more numerous the exchanges of ideas between teachers and principals.
4. Made more numerous the exchanges of ideas between teachers.

Over sixty per cent of both responding teachers and

principals agreed that the criteria or the in-service evaluative meetings had:

1. Made deficiencies present in an elementary school program clearer.
2. Made clearer the number of various aids and guides a teacher might enlist toward enlightenment.
3. Made clearer the need for teacher responsibility for leadership in the continuous evaluation in the elementary school.
4. Made clearer the recognition of areas of strengths and weaknesses in an elementary school program.

Over fifty per cent of both reporting teachers and principals agreed that the criteria or the in-service evaluative meetings had:

1. Made the role of the elementary school in the total educational program clearer.
2. Made clearer the knowledge and skill needed in evaluation.
3. Made necessary an increased study of aids, manuals, and texts pertaining to the elementary program.
4. Made clearer the definite and realistic views of attainable goals toward which to strive.
5. Made clearer guidelines for making even more frequent personal evaluations.
6. Made clearer the need for personal and building

evaluation.

7. Made systematic and definite instruction clearer.

Over forty per cent of both reporting teachers and principals agreed that the criteria or the in-service evaluation meetings had:

1. Made new ways to attack deficient areas of an elementary school program clearer.
2. Made a re-evaluation of a curricular area in the light of the total elementary school program necessary.
3. Made staff preparation through preparatory readings in professional literature necessary.
4. Made objective analyzation of past experiences and anticipation of needs clearer.
5. Made a thorough study of the evaluative criteria necessary.

Over thirty per cent of both reporting teachers and principals agreed that the criteria or the in-service evaluative meetings were:

1. Deserving of more time than was available due to teacher load and other in-service commitments.
2. Valuable and well received.

Over twenty per cent of both responding teachers and principals agreed that the criteria had made clearer the need for psychological preparation on the part of the

individual or the staff to make valid and reliable evaluations.

Over ten per cent of both reporting teachers and principals agreed that a curricular area needs concentrated evaluation for periods of time longer than one month.

Fewer than five per cent of reporting teachers agreed that the criteria and the in-service evaluative meetings were of no help in improving teacher efficiency.

Variances of fourteen, fifteen, twenty, and twenty-two percentage points, respectively, indicated that both reporting principals and teachers did not agree on the extent to which the criteria and the in-service evaluative meetings had:

1. Made deficiencies present in an elementary school program clearer.
2. Made clearer the need for objective analyzation of past experiences and anticipation of needs.
3. Made definite and realistic views of attainable goals toward which to strive clearer.
4. Made clearer the necessity of psychological preparation on the part of the individual or the staff to make valid and reliable evaluations.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The problem of this study was to ascertain the reactions of both teachers and principals concerning the effectiveness of the elementary evaluative in-service program conducted in the public elementary schools of Des Moines, Iowa during the 1962-63 school year. More specifically, through a questionnaire sent to Des Moines elementary school personnel, this study attempted to answer the following questions:

1. In what ways were regular organized in-service meetings concerned with the elementary evaluative criteria of help in improving teacher efficiency?
2. How were the elementary evaluative criteria, which were included in the elementary evaluative program, helpful in suggesting ways to improve teacher efficiency?
3. In what ways did the elementary evaluative criteria help to motivate teachers to make personal preparations for periodic self-evaluation?
4. Which in-service experiences motivated by the elementary evaluative criteria were identifiable by teachers and principals as effective and worthy of consideration for future use?

A group of 145 elementary teachers--seventeen per cent of the total 824.5 elementary teachers employed in the Des Moines public schools--were polled. Of this group, 118, or eighty-one per cent, returned questionnaires. This was fourteen per cent of the elementary teaching staff.

The entire staff, or one hundred per cent, of the forty-eight elementary building principals was included in the survey. Thirteen of the forty-eight principals were the administrative heads of two schools and were to complete separate questionnaires for each of the twenty-six schools they represented. Responses to the questionnaire gave a representation of eighty-nine per cent of the buildings.

I. SUMMARY

In regard to the initial question concerning organizational structure of, the frequency of, and the methods used in regular organized in-service meetings concerned with the elementary evaluative criteria, responding principals replied that they had presided over the introductory meeting, after which the teachers voluntarily assumed responsibility for the following monthly meetings. For the main part, teachers then organized into small committees which led the faculty in general k-6 vertical evaluations of curricular areas and invited consultants, guest speakers, and resource people to speak to the faculty or held faculty

discussions which were based upon emergent leadership. Both the responses of teachers and principals indicated no list of "better" or "effective" methods which were used in the in-service evaluative meetings. However, both principals and teachers indicated that: (1) when the teachers were in charge they more effectively realized their responsibility in evaluation; (2) the teachers charged with evaluative meeting leadership gained the most from that meeting; and (3) there was increased appreciation for other staff members and their role in the educative process.

Both principal and teacher respondents agreed that the in-service evaluative meetings were of effective help in improving teacher efficiency in four major ways: (1) the necessity of staff participation and cooperation in evaluation was clearer; (2) the need for teacher responsibility for leadership in the continuous evaluation of the elementary school was recognized; (3) deficiencies present in an elementary school program were recognized; and (4) the role of the particular grade or subject in the total elementary curriculum was clearer.

The criteria effectively motivated teachers to make personal preparations for periodic self-evaluations largely in two ways: increased exchanges of ideas between teachers and principals and increased exchanges of ideas between teachers. This was verified by both responding teachers and

principals.

Both principals and teachers agreed that the elementary evaluative criteria were helpful in effectively suggesting ways to improve teacher efficiency in four major ways: (1) definite and realistic views of attainable goals toward which to strive were clearer; (2) a clearer recognition of areas of strengths and weaknesses in an elementary school program was gained; (3) suggestion of the need for personal and building evaluation was made; and (4) the role of the elementary school curriculum in the total educational program was suggested.

In reference to general considerations or suggestions that pertained to the elementary evaluative criteria or the in-service building meetings, the majority of both principals' and teachers' replies centered around seven thoughts: (1) the criteria were deserving of more time than was available due to teacher load and other in-service commitments; (2) the in-service evaluative meetings were valuable and well received; (3) a curricular area needs concentrated evaluation for periods of time longer than one month; (4) there was increased recognition of staff leadership and creative abilities; (5) the teachers charged with evaluative meeting leadership gained the most from that meeting; (6) there was increased staff awareness of what is being done before and after a particular grade level of work; and (7)

selection of fewer curricular areas to be evaluated during a one-year period might prove worthy of consideration.

II. CONCLUSIONS

On the basis of the summary presented, the writer has concluded:

1. That the criteria constructed by the elementary principals can be used effectively.
2. That voluntary leadership on the part of the teacher was relatively effective.
3. That more time should be made available for in-service evaluative meetings.
4. That the effectiveness of the criteria might be increased through representative teacher participation in further construction or revision of the criteria.
5. That increased meeting effectiveness might be obtained by extending the introductory stages of evaluation.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

Based upon the review of the literature, the responses of both teachers and principals to the questionnaires, and conclusions from those responses, the following recommendations are made:

1. That the in-service self-evaluative program should be continued.
2. That it be emphasized that the calendar of evaluative meetings was suggestive and that periods of time longer than one month may be used freely.
3. That teachers should continue to be responsible for conducting the evaluative meetings.
4. That representative teachers from the school system participate in further construction or revision of the criteria.
5. That the introductory stages of evaluation which were conducted by the principals be of longer duration.
6. That a follow-up program be devised for evaluating the success of any recommendations that are implemented.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS

- Archer, Clifford P. Elementary Education in Rural Areas. New York: Ronald Press Co., 1958.
- Butler, J. Donald. Four Philosophies and Their Practice in Education and Religion. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1951.
- Caswell, Hollis L., and A. Wellesley Foshay. Education in the Elementary School. Third edition. New York: American Book Co., 1957.
- Cramer, Roscoe V., and Otto E. Domian. Administration and Supervision in the Elementary School. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1960.
- Dewey, John. Logic: The Theory of Inquiry. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1938.
- _____. The Sources of a Science of Education. New York: Horace Liveright, 1929.
- Elsbree, Willard S., and Harold J. McNally. Elementary School Administration and Supervision. Second edition. New York: American Book Co., 1959.
- Harris, Chester W. (ed.). Encyclopedia of Educational Research. Third edition. New York: Macmillan Co., 1960.
- Herrick, Virgil E. Issues in Elementary Education. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Burgess Publishing Co., 1954.
- Hicks, Hanne J. Administrative Leadership in the Elementary School. New York: Ronald Press Co., 1956.
- Morphet, Egar L., Roe L. Johns, and Theodore L. Reller. Educational Administration Concepts, Practices, and Issues. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1959.
- Ragan, William B. Modern Elementary Curriculum. New York: Dryden Press, 1960.

Reavis, William C., and others. Administering the Elementary School. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1953.

Shane, Harold G., and E. T. McSwain. Evaluation and the Elementary Curriculum. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1958.

Slavson, S. R., and Robert K. Speer. Science in the New Education. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1934.

Smith, E. R., and Ralph W. Tyler. Appraising and Recording Student Progress. New York: Harper Brothers, 1942.

Wrightstone, J. Wayne. An Appraisal of Newer Practices in Selected Public Schools. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1935.

_____. Appraisal of Newer School Practices. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1938.

B. PUBLICATIONS OF THE GOVERNMENT, LEARNED SOCIETIES, AND OTHER ORGANIZATIONS

Boston University. Elementary Evaluative Criteria. An Evaluative Instrument Prepared by Graduate Students. Boston: Boston University Press, 1953.

California Elementary School Administrators Association. The Characteristics of the Good Elementary School. A Study Prepared by California Elementary School Administrators. San Francisco: California Elementary School Administrators Association, 1957.

Committee for the Cooperative Study of Secondary School Standards. Evaluative Criteria. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1950.

Connecticut State Department of Education. How to Recognize a Good Elementary School. A Guide for Evaluation of Connecticut Elementary Schools, Bulletin 68. Hartford, Connecticut: Bureau of School and Community Services, January, 1956.

Department of Public Instruction. How Good Is Your Program?
A Report Prepared by Pennsylvania Educators. Harris-
burg, Pennsylvania: Department of Public Instruction,
1957.

Des Moines Public Schools. Elementary Evaluative Criteria.
An Evaluative Instrument Prepared by Des Moines Elemen-
tary Principals. Des Moines, Iowa: Des Moines Public
Schools, 1962.

National Education Association. How Good Are Your Schools?
Washington: National Education Association, 1958.

New Jersey School Development Council. The Learning Envi-
ronment. New Brunswick: New Jersey School Development
Council, 1961.

Oklahoma Curriculum Improvement Commission. Evaluation
Manual for the Improvement of Elementary Schools. An
Evaluative Instrument Prepared by Oklahoma Educators.
Oklahoma City: Oklahoma Curriculum Improvement Commis-
sion, 1958.

Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools.
Evaluating the Elementary School. Atlanta, Georgia:
Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools,
1951.

St. Louis Public Schools, Evaluation Handbook for Elementary
Schools. An Evaluative Instrument Prepared by St. Louis
Educators. St. Louis, Missouri: St. Louis Public
Schools, 1952.

State Department of Education. Standards for Elementary
Schools in Oregon. Salem, Oregon: State Department of
Education, 1959.

Teacher Education Workshop. Is Yours an Excellent School?
Nashville, Tennessee: George Peabody College for
Teachers, 1948.

Texas State Department of Education. Handbook for Self-
Appraisal and Improvement of Elementary Schools. An
Evaluative Instrument Prepared by Texas Educators.
Austin, Texas: Texas State Department of Education,
1948.

C. PERIODICALS

"Evaluation in the Secondary School," Bulletin of the Department of Secondary School Principals, XXXII (April, 1948), 154-161.

Lonsdale, Bernard J., and Afton D. Nance. "Evaluating the Elementary School," California Educational Journal, XXX (May, 1961), 67-77.

Lucio, William H. "Evaluation of the Educational Program," Review of Educational Research, XXIX (April, 1959), 15-17.

Shane, Harold G. "Recent Developments in Elementary School Evaluation," Journal of Educational Research, LIV (March, 1951), 425-439.

Wrightstone, J. Wayne. "Evaluation of the Experiment With the Activity Program in New York City Elementary Schools," Journal of Educational Research, XXXVIII (December, 1934), 252-257.

D. ESSAYS AND ARTICLES IN COLLECTIONS

Wrightstone, J. Wayne. "Evaluation," Encyclopedia of Educational Research, Walter S. Monroe, editor. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1950.

APPENDIX

March 22, 1963

Dear Principal,

As a project for a field report in educational research at Drake University, I am conducting a survey concerned with the elementary evaluative criteria used in identifying the strengths and weaknesses in the elementary curricular areas such as language arts, social studies, art, physical education, etc.

The primary purpose of the criteria was two-fold: self-evaluation and improvement of the elementary school, and in-service education for the teachers. Such a purpose demands that reports of progress be made periodically denoting the extent to which the instrument has been effective, and, in addition, which in-service experiences were identifiable as effective and worthy of consideration for future use. This survey is to function as such an indicator.

The field report is NOT an evaluation of any principal, the methods employed by any principal, or the total evaluative program. It is merely a report of progress on this program to date.

The information secured will be kept strictly confidential and no names will be used or mentioned in the survey. This study, as are many other studies in education, is to see how we can best improve our schools.

In closing I would like to thank you for your prompt consideration and time. If you should like a summary of the questionnaire, I would be pleased to send one to you.

Sincerely yours,

James Pierson

Directions: Upon completion of the questionnaire, place it in the enclosed self-addressed envelope, seal the envelope, and send it to me through the weekly school messenger service.

1. If you conducted a regular organized program of in-service meetings concerned with the elementary evaluative criteria, briefly summarize below the methods used.

Please place a check mark in the blank preceding the response(s) designating the way(s) in which the elementary evaluative in-service program was of help to your staff.

2. In what ways have you seen staff improvement that you contribute to regular organized in-service meetings concerned with the evaluative criteria?
 - ☐ A. Increased teacher responsibility for leadership in continuous evaluation of an elementary school.
 - ☐ B. Increased knowledge and skill in evaluation.
 - ☐ C. Increased recognition of deficiencies present in an elementary program.
 - ☐ D. Increased realization of the necessity of staff participation and cooperation in evaluation.
 - ☐ E. Increased awareness of various aids and guides a teacher might enlist toward enlightenment.
 - ☐ F. Increased recognition of new ways to attack deficient areas of an elementary school program.
 - ☐ G. A clearer understanding of the role of a particular grade or subject in the total elementary curriculum.

- _____ H. A clearer understanding of the role of the elementary school in the total educational program.
- _____ I. Other _____

- _____ J. There has been no staff improvement that can be contributed to regular organized in-service meetings concerned with the evaluative criteria.

3. In what ways have you seen staff improvement that you contribute to the elementary evaluative criteria which were utilized in regular organized in-service meetings?

- _____ A. More definite and realistic views of attainable goals toward which to strive.
- _____ B. Evidence of even more frequent informal personal evaluations.
- _____ C. A clearer recognition of areas of strength and deficiency in an elementary program.
- _____ D. An increased recognition of needs for personal and building evaluations.
- _____ E. A clearer understanding of systematic and definite instruction.
- _____ F. Increased objectivity in analyzing past situations and anticipation of needs.
- _____ G. Re-evaluations of a particular curriculum area in light of the total elementary program.
- _____ H. Increased reading of professional literature.
- _____ I. Increased study of aids, manuals, and texts pertaining to the elementary program.
- _____ J. An increased exchange of ideas between teachers and principals.
- _____ K. A clearer understanding of the role of the elementary school curriculum in the total educational program.

- _____ L. Psychological preparation on the part of the staff to make valid and reliable evaluations.
- _____ M. A thorough study of the skills and understandings to be taught which were contained in the elementary evaluative criteria.
- _____ N. Increased exchanges of ideas between teachers.
- _____ O. Other _____
- _____ P. There has been no staff improvement that can be contributed to the elementary evaluative criteria used in regular organized in-service meetings.

4. Do you have any general considerations or suggestions pertaining to the evaluative criteria or the in-service meetings concerned with the evaluative criteria?
(Explain briefly below.)

March 26, 1963

Dear Teacher,

As a project for a field report in educational research at Drake University, I am conducting a survey concerned with the elementary evaluative criteria used in identifying the strengths and weaknesses in elementary curricular areas such as language arts, social studies, art, physical education, etc.

The primary purpose of the criteria was two-fold: self-evaluation and improvement of the elementary school, and in-service education for the teachers. Such a purpose demands that reports of progress be made periodically denoting the extent to which the instrument has been effective, and, in addition, which in-service experiences were identifiable as effective and worthy of consideration for future use. This survey is to function as such an indicator.

The field report is NOT an evaluation of any teacher, the methods of self-evaluation employed by any teacher, or the total evaluative program. It is merely a report of progress on this program to date.

The information secured will be kept strictly confidential and no names will be used or mentioned in the survey. This study, as are many other studies in education, is to see how we can best improve our schools.

In closing I would like to thank you for your prompt consideration and time. If you should like a summary of the questionnaire, I would be pleased to send one to you.

Sincerely yours,

James Pierson

Directions: Please place a check mark in the blank preceding the response(s) designating the way(s) in which the elementary evaluative in-service program was of help to you.

Upon the completion of the questionnaire, place it in the enclosed self-addressed envelope, seal the envelope, and send it to me through the weekly school messenger service.

1. If regular organized in-service meetings concerned with the elementary evaluative criteria were conducted in your school, how were these meetings of help in improving your efficiency as a teacher?

There was an increased awareness of:

- _____ A. The necessity of staff participation and cooperation in evaluation.
- _____ B. The role of the elementary school in the total educational program.
- _____ C. Deficiencies present in an elementary school program.
- _____ D. New ways to attack deficient areas of an elementary school program.
- _____ E. Knowledge and skill in evaluation.
- _____ F. The role of the particular grade or subject in the total elementary curriculum.
- _____ G. Various aids and guides a teacher might enlist toward enlightenment.
- _____ H. The need for teacher responsibility for leadership in continuous evaluation of the elementary school.
- _____ I. Other _____
- _____ J. The in-service meetings concerned with the elementary evaluative criteria were of no help in improving my efficiency as a teacher.

2. In what way(s) did the elementary evaluative criteria help to motivate you to make personal preparations for periodic self-evaluation?

The criteria motivated:

- _____ A. A thorough study of the evaluative criteria.
- _____ B. Psychological preparation of myself to make valid and reliable evaluations.
- _____ C. Objective analyzation of past situations and anticipation of needs.
- _____ D. A study of aids, manuals, and texts pertaining to the elementary program.
- _____ E. Preparatory readings in professional literature.
- _____ F. Exchanges of ideas between teachers.
- _____ G. Exchanges of ideas between teacher and principal.
- _____ H. A re-evaluation of a particular curricular area.
- _____ I. Other _____
- _____ J. The elementary evaluative criteria did not motivate me to make periodic personal preparation for self-evaluation.

3. How were the elementary evaluative materials which were included in the elementary evaluative program helpful in suggesting ways to improve your efficiency as a teacher?

The evaluative criteria was helpful in suggesting:

- _____ A. Definite and realistic views of attainable goals toward which to strive.
- _____ B. Guides for making even more frequent informal personal evaluations.

- _____ C. A clearer recognition of areas of strengths and deficiencies in an elementary program.
- _____ D. The needs for personal and building evaluation.
- _____ E. The role of the elementary school curriculum in the total educational program.
- _____ F. Systematic and definite instruction.
- _____ G. Other _____
- _____ H. The elementary evaluative materials which were included in the elementary evaluative program were not helpful in suggesting ways to improve my efficiency as a teacher.

4. Do you have any general considerations or suggestions pertaining to the evaluative criteria or the in-service meetings concerned with the evaluative criteria? (Explain briefly below.)